REPORTED BY: SHERRI L. PENNY, RPR, FCRR

(228) 563-1781

2012 15TH STREET, SUITE 403

GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI 39501

24

25

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	VOLUME III
3	Jury Instructions Given178
4	Closing Argument by Ms. Rose189
5	Closing Argument by Mr. Weber196
6	Closing Argument by Mr. Buckner197
7	Verdict201
8	Reporter's Certificate208
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	II

Case 1:22-cr-00058-LG-BWR Document 61 Filed 12/06/22 Page 2 of 37 173

1 THE COURT: Good morning to everyone. Is the government ready to proceed this morning? 2 3 MS. ROSE: Good morning, Your Honor. Yes, we are. **THE COURT:** Is the defendant ready to proceed? 4 5 MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Very well. Let the record reflect that 6 7 the Court has conducted an in-chambers charge conference at which time there were some adjustments made to the Court's 8 9 proposed instructions. We'll now take up any objections that 10 either side may have to the Court's proposed instructions to 11 the jury. Mr. Buckner, Ms. Rose, on behalf of the government, 12 have you had an opportunity to review the Court's proposed instructions? 13 14 MR. BUCKNER: Yes, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: And the form of the verdict? 16 MR. BUCKNER: Yes, Your Honor. 17 **THE COURT:** Does the government have any objections 18 to the proposed jury instructions and form of the verdict? 19 MR. BUCKNER: No, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Weber and Ms. Tynes, have you also had an opportunity review the Court's proposed instructions as 21 well as the form of the verdict? 22 MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And did you have an opportunity to go 24 over them with Mr. Daniels? 25

1 MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does Mr. Daniels have any objections to the Court's proposed instructions?

MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor. Specifically on Page 8, the Court defines the phrase "unlawful user of a controlled substance." We submitted to the Court a proposed definition of that particular phrase. We provided the Court with two alternatives, one was a definition from the Fifth Circuit case of United States versus Patterson. And then the second -- the alternative definition is from the case of Morales-Lopez, that's the District of Utah case that was decided on June 30th of 2022.

THE COURT: Would you like to submit your proposed instruction that the Court has reviewed as an exhibit to this hearing?

MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. BUCKNER: No objection to the submission, Your Honor. If the Court wants to hear argument from the government, we can provide some for the record, but --

THE COURT: No, I've heard a lot of argument, but I am going to stick with the definition that's used in the Eighth Circuit that's taken from the Code of Federal Regulations. It seems to me that not only be a more comprehensive definition of a user, but it has also been tested in that circuit, as well as

in many other circuits and approved. But Mr. Weber, your record is made. Your request for that instruction that you have submitted, that is denied. I believe my instruction covers it.

MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor. And at this time I would also renew any Rule 29 motion for the record, and renew both motions to dismiss that were filed on behalf of Mr. Daniels.

THE COURT: Very well. As I have told you before, the question of whether or not the statute is unconstitutionally vague, I have taken that -- I have preserved that matter pending the jury resolution of the case one way or the other. The other motion is denied.

With the form of the verdict, does the defendant have any objections to the form of the verdict?

MR. WEBER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I have discussed closing arguments with both sides. The Court feels, under the circumstances, 20 minutes is sufficient for closing arguments. The government has elected to take 15 minutes on the first side and 5 minutes at the end. And Mr. Weber, I think you will take all 20 minutes in between.

Let the record also reflect that the Court intends to instruct the jury first, that is to provide the jury with the Court's instructions prior to closing arguments. And I also

intend to provide each member of the jury with a copy of the 1 2 Court's instructions that they may take back to the jury room 3 with them. Any objection to that procedure on behalf of the 4 government? 5 MS. ROSE: No objection, Your Honor. Any objection to that procedure on behalf 6 THE COURT: of the defendant? 7 No, Your Honor. 8 MR. WEBER: 9 In addition to that, I will also be THE COURT: sending back a redacted copy of the charge, that is the 10 11 indictment, for the jury to follow along the actual charge. 12 Any objection to that procedure on behalf of government? MS. ROSE: No, Your Honor. 13 14 **THE COURT:** Any objection by the defendant? 15 No, Your Honor. MR. WEBER: 16 THE COURT: Very well. I think that covers it for 17 Anything else that we need to take up at this time on 18 behalf of the government? 19 MS. ROSE: No, thank you, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** Anything on behalf of the defendant? 20 21 MR. WEBER: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Very well. I appreciate all your help. 22 23 And counsel, we will be in recess until the jury has assembled. I have asked them to assemble at 10:30, so that will give us at 24 least a 25-minute opportunity to prepare. We'll be in recess 25

1 to await the jury's return.

(RECESS TAKEN AT 10:03 A.M. UNTIL 10:33 A.M.)

THE COURT: I am advised that the jury is all here and they are prepared to proceed. Is the government ready?

MS. ROSE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is the defendant ready?

MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please bring in the jury.

(JURY IN AT 10:35 A.M.)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. And I hope that you are well. The parties have indicated to the Court that they are ready to proceed. The Court has prepared the instructions on the law. This, of course, is the law that you must follow in returning a verdict in this case. I have taken the liberty of making a copy of these instructions for each of you so you can follow along with me as I read them, and you will be permitted to take the instructions on the law back to the jury room with you during deliberations.

Stanley, would you give each member of the jury a copy of the instructions?

(JURY INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN)

Members of the jury, in any jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges; the other is the jury. It is my duty to preside over the trial and to decide what evidence is proper for your consideration. It is also my

duty at the end of the trial to explain to you the rules of law that you must follow and apply in arriving at your verdict.

First, I will give you some general instructions which apply in every case. For example, instructions about the burden of proof and how to judge the believability of witnesses. Then I will give you some specific rules of law about this particular case. And finally, I will explain to you the procedures you should follow in your deliberations.

You, as juror, are the judges of the facts, but in determining what actually happened, that is in reaching your decision as to the facts, it is your sworn duty to follow all of the rules of law as I explain them to you.

You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction, or to question the wisdom or correctness of any rule I may state to you. You must not substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be.

It is your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you regardless of the consequences. It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted by the parties as jurors, and they have the right to expect nothing less.

The indictment or formal charge against a defendant is not evidence of quilt. Indeed, the defendant is presumed by the

law to be innocent. The defendant begins with a clean slate.

The law does not require a defendant to prove his innocence or
to produce any evidence at all, and no inference whatever may
be drawn from the election of a defendant not to testify.

The government has the burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and if it fails to do so you must acquit the defendant. While the government's burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, it is not necessary that the defendant's guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the government's proof exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the defendant's guilt.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in making the most important decisions of your own affairs.

As I told you earlier, it is your duty to determine the facts. To do so, you must consider only the evidence presented during the trial. Evidence is the sworn testimony of the witnesses, including stipulations and exhibits. The questions, statements, objections and arguments made by the lawyers are not evidence.

The function of the lawyers is to point out those things that are most significant or most helpful to their side of the

case, and in so doing to call your attention to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your notice. In the final analysis, however, it is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls in the case. What the lawyers say is not binding upon you.

Do not assume from anything I may have done or said during the trial that I have an opinion concerning any of the issues in this case. Except for the instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything I may have said during the trial in arriving at your own verdict.

In considering the evidence, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts which have been established by the evidence.

"Direct evidence" is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness.

"Circumstantial evidence" is proof of a chain of events and

Do not be concerned about whether evidence is "direct evidence" or "circumstantial evidence." You should consider and weigh all of the evidence that was presented to you.

circumstances indicating that something is or is not a fact.

The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. But the law

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

182

requires that you, after weighing all of the evidence, whether direct or circumstantial, be convinced of the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt before you can find him guilty.

I remind you that it is your job to decide whether the government has approved the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. In doing so, you must consider all of the evidence. That doesn't mean, however, that you accept all of the evidence as true or accurate.

You are the sole judges of the credibility or believability of each witness and the weight to be given to the witnesses's testimony. An important part of your job will be making judgments about the testimony of the witnesses who testified in the case. You should decide whether you believe all, some part, or none of what each person had to say and how important that testimony was. In making that decision, I suggest that you ask yourselves a few questions: Did the witness impress you as honest? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness have any relationship with either the government or the defense? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness clearly see or hear the things about which he or she testified? Did the witness have the opportunity and the ability to understand the questions clearly and answer them

directly? Did the witness's testimony differ from the testimony of other witnesses? These are a few of the considerations that will help you determine the accuracy of what each witness said.

Your job is to think about the testimony of each witness you have heard and decide how much you believe of what each witness had to say. In making up your mind and reaching a verdict, do not make any decisions simply because there were more witnesses on one side than on the other. Do not reach a conclusion on a particular point just because there were more witnesses testifying for one side on that point. You will always bear in mind that the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence.

A defendant in a criminal trial has a constitutional right not to be compelled to testify. Further, you must neither discuss this matter nor permit it to enter into your deliberations in any way.

Certain exhibits have been identified as typewritten transcripts of the oral conversations which can be heard on the tape recordings also received into evidence. The transcripts also purport to identify the speakers engaged in such conversations.

I have admitted the transcripts for the limited and secondary purpose of aiding you in following the content of the

1 conversations as you listen to the tape recordings, and also to 2 aid you in identifying speakers.

You are specifically instructed that whether the transcripts correctly or incorrectly reflect the content of the conversations or the identity of the speakers is entirely for you to determine based upon your own evaluation of the testimony you have heard concerning the preparation of the transcripts and from your own examination of the transcripts in relation to your hearing of the tape recordings themselves as the primary evidence of their own contents. And if you should determine that the transcripts are in any respect incorrect, or unreliable, you should disregard them to that extent. It is what you hear on the tapes that is evidence, not the transcripts.

You are here to decide whether the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the crime charged. The defendant is not on trial for any act, conduct, or other offense not alleged in the indictment.

If the defendant is found guilty, it will be my duty to decide what the punishment will be. You should not be concerned with punishment in any way. It should not enter your consideration or discussion.

You will note that the indictment charges that the offenses were committed on or about a specified date. The government does not have to prove that the crime was committed

on that exact date, so long as the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed the crime on a date reasonably near the date stated on the indictment.

Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 922, makes it a crime for anyone to possess a firearm under certain conditions. In this case, the defendant is charged with knowingly possessing a firearm which was in and affecting interstate or foreign commerce while knowingly being an unlawful user of a controlled substance.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant knowingly possessed a firearm;

Second, that at the time the defendant possessed the

firearm, the defendant was an unlawful user of a controlled substance;

Third, the defendant knew he was an unlawful user of a controlled substance;

And fourth, that the firearm possessed traveled in interstate or foreign commerce; that is before the defendant possessed the firearm, the firearm had traveled at some time from one state to another or between any part of the United States and any other country.

The term "firearm" means any weapon that will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile

by the action of an explosive.

Marijuana is a controlled substance within the meaning of the law. The term "marijuana" means all parts of the plant, cannabis sativa L, whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin.

The phrase "unlawful user of a controlled substance" means a person who uses a controlled substance in a manner other than as prescribed by a licensed physician. The defendant must have been actively engaged in use of a controlled substance during the time he possessed the firearm, but the law does not require that he used the controlled substance at the precise time he possessed the firearm. Such use is not limited to the use of drugs on a particular day, or within a matter of days or weeks before, but rather that the unlawful use has occurred recently enough to indicate that the individual is actively engaged in such conduct.

An inference that a person was a user of a controlled substance may be drawn from the evidence of a pattern of use or possession of controlled substance that reasonably covers the time the firearm was possessed.

"Possession," as that term is used in these instructions, may be one of two kinds: Actual possession or constructive possession.

2

A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing at a given time is in actual possession of it.

3 4

has both the power and the intention, at a given time, to

A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly

5 6 exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or

through another person, or persons, is in constructive

7

8

9

possession of it.

Possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is If two or more persons share actual or constructive sole.

11

10

possession of a thing, possession is joint.

12

You may find that the element of possession is present if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant had

13

actual or constructive possession, either alone or jointly with

15

14

others.

accident.

count of the indictment.

16

The word "knowingly" as that term has been used from time

17

to time in these instructions, means the act was done

18

voluntarily and intentionally, not because of mistake or

19

20

To reach a verdict, whether it is guilty or not guilty,

21

all of you must agree. Your verdict must be unanimous on each

22

It is your duty to consult with one another and to

23 24

deliberate in an effort to reach agreement if you can do so.

25

Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after

an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors. Do not let bias, sympathy or prejudice that you may feel toward one side or the other influence your decision in any way. During your deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own opinions and change your mind if convinced that you were wrong. But do not give up your honest beliefs as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

During your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone by any means about this case. You may not use any electronic device or media, such as a telephone, cell phone, smart phone, iPhone or computer, the Internet, any Internet service or any text or instant messaging service, or any Internet chatroom, blog, or website, such as Facebook, LinkedIn, YouTube or Twitter, to communicate to anyone any information about this case or to conduct research about this case until I accept your verdict.

Remember at all times, you are judges, judges of the facts. Your duty is to decide whether the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

When you go to the jury room, the first thing that you should do is to select one of your number as a foreperson who will help to guide your deliberations and will speak for you here in the courtroom.

A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience.

The foreperson will write the unanimous answer of the jury in the space provided for each count of the indictment, either guilty or not guilty. At the conclusion of your deliberations the foreperson should date and sign the verdict.

Ladies and gentlemen, what that refers to, again, is a verdict form that has been prepared in advance for your use during deliberations, and you will have that in the jury room.

If you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, the foreperson should write the message and give it to the Court Security Officer. I will either reply in writing or bring you back into court to answer your message.

Bear in mind that you are never to reveal to any person, not even to the Court, how the jury stands numerically or otherwise on any count of the indictment until after you have reached a unanimous verdict.

Ladies and gentlemen, both sides have been given 20 minutes within which to make their closing arguments. The government bears the burden of proof, and therefore they are permitted to go first and permitted to go last, and the defendant will make closing arguments in between. You may make your closing arguments on behalf of the government.

MS. ROSE: Thank you, Your Honor.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT

MS. ROSE: Your Honor, defense counsel, ladies and

gentlemen of the jury, nothing is missing. Nothing is missing. This is a direct case. The government has proved each element beyond a reasonable doubt. I am going to go through each element with you right now. In the case of the United States versus Patrick Daniels, Jr., first we had to prove this happened on April 25th, 2022, that's not an issue. You heard multiple folks testify to that.

It happened in Hancock County, which is in the Southern Division of the Southern District of Mississippi. No disputes there.

Patrick Darnell Daniels, Jr. was the person who committed the offense. You heard Officer Bell identify him in court, and you heard his statement in court, and then you see a photo of his ID. That's also not at issue here.

That he knowingly possessed a firearm. In fact, in this case, he knowingly possessed two firearms. You heard testimony from Officer Bell that he approached the vehicle, smelled marijuana and then did a search, and that search revealed two firearms. The first firearm was found in the driver's seat, between the driver's seat and the compartment there, which was the Hellcat, the small gun, the firearm.

Then you also heard him testify that the second firearm was found in the backseat, that's the assault rifle, the big gun. You heard the defendant's statement, you heard him talk about knowingly having those firearms. You heard him talk

about how he possessed them, how he got one of them as a Father's Day gift from his girlfriend and how he got the other qun from a friend who had passed away a New Year's Eve.

There were some questions asked of Officer Bell about the eTrace system and about who possessed this gun, who owned this gun. You just heard the law, ladies and gentlemen. There's nothing about ownership. That doesn't matter. What matters here is possession. And in this case, it's very clear that the defendant possessed these guns. He was the only person in the truck, he admitted that they were his firearms. Possession here a clear. You knew he had them.

At the time of the charged act, the defendant was an unlawful user of a controlled substance. You heard in opening, defense counsel got up here and he said something is missing, something is missing, and what's going to be missing is that he is an unlawful user. And I submit to you that that is wrong. That's not missing here. There's plenty of evidence that show you he was an unlawful user of a controlled substance. You heard the Court instruct you that the controlled substance is marijuana in this case. And you heard testimony that the substance here was tested at the DEA Crime Lab, it was confirmed to be marijuana. You heard the defendant's testimony, yes, I smoke marijuana. I have smoked since I was in high school. I smoke at least 14 days out of the month.

for the tag violation, he walked up to the vehicle and he smelled marijuana, which is why he searched it in the first place. And when he searched the vehicle, what did he find in the car? The marijuana blunts, those same blunts that were sent to the DEA Crime Lab and tested and confirmed to be marijuana, a controlled substance.

A user of a controlled substance, an unlawful user, is a person who uses a controlled substance in a manner other than as prescribed by a licensed physician.

You heard the judge just instruct you on that, it's in your instructions. There's no prescription here, he wasn't on a prescription for marijuana. This isn't your regular everyday medicinal drug. This is a controlled substance. He was an unlawful user of a controlled substance and he knew he was an unlawful user of a controlled substance. He talked about it in his interview, he talked about it when he was meeting with Officer Bell on the side of the road when he got pulled over that day. Yes, I use marijuana. Yes, those blunts in the car are from my use, I have been using since I was in high school. Ladies and gentlemen, that meets the definition here. Nothing is missing.

The possessed firearm traveled in interstate or foreign commerce. Our second witness that testified yesterday, that was Shane Lynes, who is an expert witness from the ATF. And he talked to you about how both of those firearms were examined by

him and that at sometime they traveled between one state or another, or they traveled from a foreign country. The Springfield Armory Hellcat 9 mm pistol, you heard him talk about that one was made in Croatia and then imported to Springfield, Illinois, and then at some point ended up here in Mississippi. So that's how that firearm traveled in interstate commerce.

The second firearm, he discussed how that one had -- it says on the side of the gun that it was made in Summerville, South Carolina; however, it was actually manufactured in BCI Defense in Indiana. He talked to you about how the different pieces go as far as manufacturing, but then who has the rights to the firearm, etcetera. It's all pretty simple. Neither of these firearms were manufactured or came from Mississippi, so that's how we meet that element.

Ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion, on April 25th of 2022, in Hancock County, in the Southern Division of the Southern District of Mississippi, Patrick Darnell Daniels, Jr. knowingly possessed a firearm, in this case two firearms. And at the time of this act he was an unlawful user of a controlled substance and he knew he was an unlawful user of a controlled substance and that those firearms traveled in interstate or foreign commerce.

This is a direct case, it's an easy case. Just because the trial was short, just because there were only three

witnesses, just because there's only 29 exhibits, just because this wasn't a giant ongoing investigation doesn't mean something is missing. Nothing is missing. The government has proved this case beyond a reasonable doubt as to each and every element. And we would ask you to come back with the only verdict that is consistent with the evidence, the facts and the law in this case, and that is guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Rose.

Mr. Weber, you may make your closing argument on behalf of Mr. Daniels.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

MR. WEBER: May I retrieve a few exhibits, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. WEBER: Ladies and gentlemen, this is not an easy case. What you are asked to do is not easy. I disagree with the government's characterization of what you are tasked to do, and that is to determine whether or not the government has proven their case against Patrick Daniels beyond a reasonable doubt each and every element of the offense.

I told you in opening argument that something is missing, and something is missing. What is missing is that evidence, that proof beyond a reasonable doubt that will allow you to conclude that the government did, in fact, prove their case.

Let's talk about, first, let's talk about the jury

instructions. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, what is that standard? That is evidence, facts, testimony, evidence that will allow you to make a conclusion, so much so that you would not hesitate to act in the most important of your affairs, where you decide to send your children to school, where you decide to live, who you decide to marry, what type of job. Those are very important decisions that you would not hesitate to act. And in this case, the evidence is not there and it causes some hesitation. Something is missing.

Let's talk first about looking at the witnesses, three witnesses that all testified. An officer -- Officer Bell testified that he didn't realize that he was pulling over Patrick Daniels. But ladies and gentlemen, look at the unique characteristics of this vehicle that he pulled over allegedly six weeks prior. You can't tell me that Officer Bell didn't know who he was pulling over. I don't know why he wasn't truthful with you about that, but something is missing.

And if he pulled him over on March 9th with guns and bags of marijuana, where is that evidence? Where is the report? Something is missing.

He was not smoking marijuana at the time of the stop.

There's no evidence that he ever used the AR-15. There's no evidence that he ever used the 9-millimeter. There's no drug test. There's no evidence that there's marijuana in Patrick Daniels' system at the time of the stop. There's no evidence

of when he last used marijuana. And I think this is key. Because the government has to prove active use of marijuana. And what does that term mean? If he stopped two days before this stop, is that active use? If he stopped using marijuana two weeks prior to the stop, is that active use? If he stopped a month, 30 days, 60 days, 6 weeks, is he actively using marijuana at the time of the stop? It's reasonable, ladies and gentlemen, to conclude that at the time of the stop Patrick Daniels was not an active user of marijuana. The government can't rule out that Patrick Daniels, sometime prior to the stop, stopped using marijuana.

Now, there's a statement, there's an audio recording that
-- well, first off, at the time of the stop, Officer Bell
alleges that Patrick Daniels made these statements about using
marijuana 14 or 16 days out of the month, but we don't have a
recording of that. And you will see Government Exhibit G-24,
which is the audio recording, and G-24A, which is the
transcript that Officer Bell says -- and I will read it to you
if I can find it. You told me out on the scene that you were
using marijuana 14 days out of the month; is that correct? But
then he goes on to explain that he was living in his truck and
he stopped smoking in his house when I stayed there, and lately
since I been sleeping in my vehicle, I haven't really had money
to purchase any. That, ladies and gentlemen, leads you to
conclude that he had stopped using marijuana and he was not an

active user of marijuana. And the government is going to probably hold this up to you when they rebut my closing and say, well, this is proof of active use. You couldn't even role a skinny joint with this.

The judge told us at the beginning of this trial that we don't settle disputes on the dualing ground, and we don't take away a citizen -- we don't take away Patrick Daniels' liberty based on guessing and speculating. Patrick Daniels is not guilty.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Weber.

Mr. Buckner, you may finally close on behalf of the government.

MR. BUCKNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT

MR. BUCKNER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. May it please the Court.

Let's talk first about the standard of proof. The standard of proof is a heavy burden as the Court indicated. It's beyond a reasonable doubt, right, but then jury instructions make it clear that's not all doubt. That's not. We don't have to prove Mr. Daniels' guilt beyond all doubt; it's beyond a reasonable doubt. And you have seen the evidence, you have heard the testimony, you have heard arguments. And basically, this case hinges upon whether the government has proven that Mr. Daniels was an unlawful user of

a controlled substance when he possessed the firearms. That's what the case hinges on. The other elements, they're there. He clearly possessed the guns. The guns clearly traveled in interstate and foreign commerce. So let's talk a little bit about that unlawful user element.

If you look at the instructions, the judge says -- he defines "unlawful user of a controlled substance," but there's a second part to that, and that's this, that an inference that a person was a user of a controlled substance may be drawn from evidence of a pattern of use or possession of a controlled substance that reasonably covers the time the firearm was possessed. That's an inference you're permitted to make. The law allows you to make that inference, okay?

So let's talk about what the evidence actually showed in this case. Before we get to the specific pieces of evidence, though, I want to talk about the two types of evidence. The judge instructed you on direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. In this case, we have both.

Direct evidence that Mr. Daniels was an unlawful user is his confession that he was. He admitted it. He said, I smoke marijuana 14 times a month. And you know what else is interesting, the defense takes issue with the prior conversation between Task Force Officer Bell and Mr. Daniels not being recorded. Well, not only in making that admission does Mr. Daniels admit that he used marijuana 14 times a month,

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but he admits that he had the prior conversation with Officer

2 Bell. You get that? They're both there. But that's direct

evidence. He says I did it, okay, I smoked marijuana 14 times

4 a month.

> Now, the other type of evidence is circumstantial evidence. An example of circumstantial evidence would be -first, direct evidence. Direct evidence that it had rained. Ι saw it raining. That's direct evidence. Circumstantial evidence that it rained is that I hear thunder, I walk outside and the ground is wet. Circumstantial evidence says it rained, In this case, we have got circumstantial evidence, as well, that Mr. Daniels was an unlawful user. What's the circumstantial evidence? Well, Officer Bell approaches the vehicle and what does he smell? Smoked marijuana. He smells it as he approaches. He searches the vehicle and what does he find? Defense counsel is right, I'm going to hold it up: Smoked marijuana. The reason there's not enough to roll a blunt in here is because he smoked it all; it's used. circumstantial evidence that he was an unlawful user of a controlled substance that's corroborated by his confession.

> Now, the defendant keeps saying that there's something missing, there's something missing. Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard the evidence, both direct and circumstantial. At this point, the only thing missing is your verdict. Review the evidence, look at the instructions, and return the verdict that

the evidence requires, and that is guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Buckner.

Very well, then. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you will now be asked to recess into the jury room to deliberate upon your verdict. You will be provided all of the exhibits that you may wish to review. You may take a copy of the Court's instructions on the law with you as well. A verdict form will be provided for you, and a copy of the indictment will be provided for you as well.

For the remainder of the day, we will wait here until you have actually reached your verdict. You may be excused.

(JURY OUT AT 11:11 A.M.)

THE COURT: I did not mention this to the jury, but I do not intend to send the actual firearms back into the jury room, there's plenty of photographs of the firearms, unless they ask for it, I hope that they don't. But is there anything else that we need to take up on behalf of the government?

MR. BUCKNER: Your Honor, I just want to flag an issue for you. Depending on the result, there is a criminal forfeiture that was included in the indictment. And the defendant is entitled, if he so desires, to have the jury determine the issue of forfeiture. And if he wants that, it needs to be done before this jury is dismissed. So I have discussed that with opposing counsel. Just wanted to flag that for the Court before we get there, if we get there.

```
1
                THE COURT: Very good. Anything else, then, on
 2
      behalf of the defendant before we recess for the jury verdict?
 3
                MR. WEBER: No, Your Honor.
 4
                THE COURT: Very well. All right. Be in recess to
      await the verdict from the jury.
 5
           (RECESS TAKEN AT 11:22 A.M. UNTIL 12:06 A.M.)
 6
 7
                THE COURT: I am advised that the jury has reached a
               Is the government ready to proceed?
 8
      verdict.
9
               MS. ROSE: Yes, Your Honor.
10
                THE COURT: Is the defendant ready to proceed, Mr.
11
      Weber?
12
               MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Very well. Please bring in the jury.
13
           (JURY IN AT 12:08 P.M.)
14
15
           (JURY VERDICT RETURNED AT 12:08 P.M.)
16
                THE COURT: Mr. Lafollette, I am given to understand
17
      that you are the presiding juror in this case; is that correct?
18
                JURY FOREPERSON: Yes, sir.
19
                THE COURT: I am also advised that the jury has
      reached a verdict; is that also correct?
20
21
                JURY FOREPERSON: Yes, sir.
                THE COURT: Is it a unanimous verdict?
22
23
                JURY FOREPERSON: Yes, sir.
24
                THE COURT: Would you please provide the verdict to
      the Court Security Officer?
25
```

MR. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor. I'd like to pole the jury, please.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Very well. Ladies and gentlemen, the

```
1
      defendant has the right to ask that the jury be polled.
 2
      that means is I am going to ask each of you in turn if that is,
 3
      in fact, your verdict, that's the question. When I read your
 4
      name, if that is your verdict, say yes. If it is not your
 5
      verdict, say no.
 6
           Cassandra Lawless?
 7
                JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: Michael Witt?
 8
9
                JUROR: Yes.
10
                THE COURT: Tammy Lastinger?
11
                JUROR: Yes.
12
                THE COURT: Braden Hawkins?
                JUROR: Yes.
13
                THE COURT: Mickie Key?
14
15
                JUROR: Yes.
16
                THE COURT: Michelle McBride?
17
                JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: Darnell Hebert?
18
19
                JUROR: Yes.
20
                THE COURT: Glynis Williams?
21
                JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: KayeLynn Holman?
22
23
                JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: Thomas Lafollette?
24
25
                JUROR: Yes.
```

THE COURT: Virginia Huntly?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And Thomas LeMaster?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Weber, by my count all 12 have agreed it is, in fact, a unanimous verdict. Anything else on behalf of the defendant?

MR. WEBER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, of course you have concluded your work in this case, and you are also advised that you do not have to call your number anymore. You have completed not only your duty here, but you also have the benefit of that two-year exemption.

Now, in an effort to memorialize that, we have prepared some certificates of your attendance here today, as well as some other materials that you may need to provide to your employers. I am going to ask that you wait a few minutes back in the jury room, I think it's going to be longer than a few minutes, but a few minutes back in the courtroom before the Clerk of the Court bring all of those materials to you.

In addition to that, I am advised that your lunches have arrived. And even though you have completed your work, I would encourage you to go ahead and sit back in the jury room, if you wish, and enjoy that the lunches that the Court has provided.

We could not have anticipated that you would've returned a verdict prior to their arrival, but be that as it may, they're your lunches and you're welcome to either eat them here or take them with you if you wish to do so.

In the meantime, let me, on behalf of the Court, on behalf of the litigants, and on behalf of the lawyers in this case, thank you, sincerely thank you for your duty, that is the duty that you have undertaken to try this case and to reach a verdict based on law and evidence.

If there's nothing else, thank you, ladies and gentlemen, you may go back to the jury room.

(JURY OUT AT 12:13 P.M.)

THE COURT: I want to take up then, if we can, for purposes of the record the question of forfeiture. I am given to understand, Mr. Weber, that Mr. Daniels does not intend to contest forfeiture of the weapons, the magazines and the ammunition?

MR. WEBER: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else on behalf of the government?

MS. ROSE: No. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Pursuant to Rule 32.2 of the Federal
Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Court first finds that the
indictment did contain notice to the defendant that the
government would seek to forfeit the weapon, the magazines and

1 the ammunition in this case under the appropriate statute.

It's also the finding of the Court, pursuant to that same rule, that based on the finding of the jury, the defendant was in possession of these firearms and was an unlawful user of a controlled substance, that the Court determines that the government has established the requisite nexus between the property and the offense.

I'll ask that the government prepare a preliminary order of forfeiture, which I will enter, and will enter final judgment at the time of sentencing.

Sentencing in this matter is scheduled for October 18th, 2022, at 1:30 p.m. here in Gulfport. That will be Mr. Daniels' next scheduled court appearance. Again, that is October 18th, 2022, at 1:30 p.m.

Is there anything else we need to take up on behalf of the government?

MS. ROSE: No. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Weber, anything else we need to take up on behalf of Mr. Daniels?

MR. WEBER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Daniels is remanded back to the custody of the U.S. Marshals. I'll ask that they return him here on the 18th of October at 1:30 p.m. at which time we will take up a sentencing hearing. And I'll look forward to getting the preliminary order of forfeiture. If there's nothing else,

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, Sherri L. Penny, RPR, FCRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me using the stenotype reporting method in conjunction with computer-aided transcription, and that same is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.